

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,137	04/20/2005	Chicko Mihara	03500.017741 6757	
****	7590 09/10/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEI	LER PLĄZA	MESH, GENNADIY		
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/532,137	MIHARA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Gennadiy Mesh	1711			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
'=	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Al</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are pending in the appear of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	wn from consideration.				
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal Pa	stent Application			

Art Unit: 1711

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Amendment

Applicant's Amendment filed on August 24,2007 is acknowledged.

Rejection is maintained as it was set forth in previous Office Action mailed on May 24,2007.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-13 of Application No.10/532,137 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,153,622. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claimed subject matter claimed in Claims 1-4 of concerning Application No.10/532,137 significantly overlapping in scope

Art Unit: 1711

with claimed subject mater of US. Patent No. 7,153,622 (claims 1- 17): chemical structures of PHA copolymers claimed in both documents are same with same area of use claimed PHA for toner composition. Note that US Patent No. 7,153,622 claimed the same PHA copolymers as disclosed in EP 1253475 (see rejection under 35 USC 102(a) in previous Office action mailed on Jan 22,2007).

2. Claims1-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1- 3 of copending Application No. 10/532136. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claimed subject matter claimed in Claims 1-4 of concerning Application No.10/532,137 significantly overlapping in scope with claimed subject mater of claims 1-3 of the copending Application No. 10/532136: specific PHA structure claimed in concerning Application "137" - see formula (1) could comprise same unit as claimed in formula (6) of copending Application "136".

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 24,2007 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

3. Regarding Applicant's arguments related to ODP rejection over US Patent 7,153,622:

as it was explained previously chemical structure of PHA claimed by US Patent 7,153,622 substantially same or identical to chemical structures claimed by concerning

Application/Control Number: 10/532,137

Art Unit: 1711

Application. Therefore, as substantially same chemical compound, PHA claimed by US Patent 7,153,622 will inherently have same properties and will be capable to perform same functions, including ability to regulate charge as a charge control agent as a part of toner composition. Note, that US Patent 7,153,622 does disclose this utility.

4. Same related to ODP rejection over Application No. 10/532136.

Therefore, Applicants arguments found not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gennadiy Mesh whose telephone number is (571) 272 2901. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m - 6 p.m.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,137 Page 5

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gennadiy Mesh Examiner Art Unit 1711

GM

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700